

## Interview Summary

Application No.

08/480,836

Applicant(s)

Rohit C. L. Sachdeva

Examiner

Dave Ghatt

Group Art Unit

3307



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dave Ghatt(3) Ed Burr(2) David Prichard

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jun 26, 1997Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claims 38, 49, 50, 54, 57, 63, 77, and 78

Identification of prior art discussed:

Impaction Post.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Following the interview on Jun 3, Mr Prichard faxed in amended claims for discussion purposes only. These claims included the language "load bearing" which Mr Prichard felt now made the claims patentably distinct over the Impaction Post article. Examiners Ghatt and Burr did not agree with this argument, so Mr Prichard said that he would submit a statement proving his point. Mr Burr then said that this would be acceptable, but the applicant should more positively recite the use of the apparatus with an orthodontic appliance. For example in claim 38, both parties agreed to the language, "An implant for use with an orthodontic appliance, the implant being usable as a load bearing member...". Similar changes were agreed to, for the other independent claims. It was also requested that the applicant included in the supplemental statement, an explanation of the meaning "orthodontic appliance".

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.